

OPINION 836

LEUCTRA STEPHENS, 1835 (INSECTA, PLECOPTERA): DESIGNATION OF A TYPE-SPECIES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers all designations of type-species for the nominal genus *Leuctra* Stephens, 1835, made prior to the present Ruling are hereby set aside, and the nominal species *Phryganea fusca* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby designated to be the type-species of that genus.

(2) The generic name *Leuctra* Stephens, 1835 (gender: feminine), type-species, by designation under the plenary powers in (1) above, *Phryganea fusca* Linnaeus, 1758, is hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Number 1776.

(3) The specific name *fusca* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Phryganea fusca* (type-species of *Leuctra* Stephens, 1835) is hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Number 2222.

HISTORY OF THE CASE (Z.N.(S.) 1671)

The present case was submitted to the office of the Commission by Prof. P. Brinck and Dr. J. Illies in November 1964. The application was sent to the printer on 22 February 1965 and was published on 18 May 1965 in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 22: 108–109. Public Notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the present case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the other prescribed serial publications (Constitution Art. 12b; *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 21: 184) and to seven entomological serials. The application was supported by Mr. D. E. Kimmins.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 20 July 1967 the Members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (67)29 either for or against the proposal set out in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 22: 209. At the close of the prescribed voting period on 20 October 1967 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative votes—twenty-one (21), received in the following order: China, Holthuis, Vokes, Sabrosky, Lemche, Evans, Obruchev, Jaczewski, Boschma, Mayr, Brinck, Munroe, Tortonese, do Amaral, Uchida, Mertens, Kraus, Binder, Alvarado, Ride, Forest.

Negative votes—one (1): Simpson.

Voting Papers not returned—one (1): Hubbs.

Commissioner Bonnet returned a late affirmative vote.

The following comments were made by Commissioners in returning their votes:

Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (2.viii.67): "I vote for this because it is too late to make a counter suggestion. Inasmuch as *Leuctra fusciventris* Stephens was one of the originally included species, I should have preferred to designate that nominal species as type-species. If granted, this proposal would apparently leave *L.*

geniculata without a generic name, but I presume this will be taken care of elsewhere. I see no need for a neotype. Brinck (1949) was able to settle the identity of *P. fusca* without it."

Prof. G. G. Simpson (25.viii.67): "That two genera have been united under the single name *Leuctra* is a zoological, not nomenclatural, conclusion already reached in 1841. This proposal asks that the name be restricted to what is plainly (and has been since 1838) the wrong genus. It also seems to leave *Leuctra*, correctly and strictly speaking, without a name."

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for names placed on Official Lists by the Ruling given in the present Opinion:

fusca, *Phryganea*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) 1 : 549

Leuctra Stephens, 1835, *Ill. Brit. Ent.* 6 : 144.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (67)29 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that Voting Paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 836.

W. E. CHINA

Acting Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

31 October 1967

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *CHARAXES JOCASTE* BUTLER (LEPIDOPTERA). (Z.N.(S.) 1806) (see volume 24, pages 255-256)

By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

Proposed use of the plenary powers in this case evades the real question, and the matter of principle involved, as to whether *Charaxes iocaste* Butler, 1865 (not *jocaste* as stated in the title of the application, in the proposals on p. 256, and elsewhere in discussion) is or is not an available name under the circumstances of the 1865 publication. I believe that this point should be faced squarely. If the name be judged unavailable, then use of the plenary powers would be unnecessary; if it be judged available, then the Plenary Powers may be invoked.

If one were to regard a group (sectional) description as making available any included nude species-group name, why then would not the mere combination with a previously described generic name likewise furnish, by association-indication, a similar group (generic) description? Rules stretched too far lose definition and precision. I prefer to regard *C. iocaste* Butler, 1865, as unavailable, it being without description or diagnosis of its own.